



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/787,032

02/24/2004

John Lees

TRX-0628 CON-01
(4346/915)

3902

7590

09/28/2004

US Intellectual Property Department
Tetra Park, Inc.
101 Corporate Woods Parkway
Vernon Hills, IL 60089

EXAMINER

HEITBRINK, TIMOTHY W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1722

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/787,032	Applicant(s) LEES ET AL.	
	Examiner Tim Heitbrink	Art Unit 1722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-27-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 24, line 12, it is unclear which "mold tool" is being claimed, the internal mold tool, the external mold tool or the mold tool in general.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 24,25,29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsumata in view of Helms and WO 98/18609.

Katsumata discloses a form, fill and seal machine to be conventional. However, Katsumata does not disclose a carton erection station, Helms discloses a carton erection station to be conventional in a packaging machine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a carton erection station in the form, fill and seal machine of Katsumata in order to receive a carton in a generally flat form and to erect a flat form carton as suggested by Helms.

While Katsumara (as modified by Helms) does not disclose a direct injection molding station for forming a closure on the container, WO 98/18609 discloses injection molding a plastics material opening device in a hole provided in a packaging sheet material using an internal mold 14, an external mold 2 and a mandrel 6 on which the internal mold is mounted.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a direct injection molding station in the apparatus of Katsumara for forming a closure as suggested by WO 98/18609.

Claims 27,28,31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsumata in view of Helms and WO 98/18609 as applied to claims 24,25,29 and 30 above, and further in view of either Hamel or McCollum et al. or Voets et al.

Katsumara (as modified by Helms and WO 98/18609) discloses injection molding a polymer closure on a carton to be conventional. However, Katsumara does not disclose cooling the mold in order to cool the injected plastic.

Each of the secondary references teach a cooled mold in the same field of endeavor in order to cool the injected plastic. See Hamel Figs. 1,6-8; McCollum et al. Figs 1,2 and Voets et al. Figs. 1 and 2.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide cooling channels in the mold of '609 in order to cool the injected plastic as suggested in any of the secondary references.

Shaping the cooling channels to have a V-shape would have been obvious in light of *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).


Claim 26 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-16 of copending Application No. 10/124968 in view of Katsumata, Helms and WO 98/18609. While 10/124968 does not claim a form, fill and seal machine with a carton erection station, an internal and external mold, a filling and sealing station, such items are well known as discussed above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim Heitbrink whose telephone number is 571-272-1132. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 5:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Tim Heitbrink
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1722
9-23-04

twH